Published on the 15th of the month

Vol. XXIX, No. 9 DECEMBER, 1939

LIBRARY
of the Pacific
CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D., F.S.A.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE
Signs of the Times:	
A Pacifist in Trouble	463
May God Defend the Right!	464
The Church and the War	466
Bishop Talbot on Police Action and War ..	468
Love, Joy and Peace	468
The Need for a Universal Religion	470
The Spirit of Man and the Spirit of God (I) ..	473
The Bishop of Truro.	
The Two Newmans	485
F. H. Amphlett Micklewright, M.A.	
Book Reviews:	
Liberalism as Doctrine and as Dogma	496
Farewell to Oxford	500
Evolution and its Modern Critics	502
The Kingdom of the Spirit	503
Correspondence:	
The Church and the War	505
Spirit-Bearing	506
Proofs of a Future Life	507
Marvels: Miraculous or Non-Miraculous? ..	510
The Spirit of the Czechs	510

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

Price 1s. net Annual Subscription, 10/6

AMERICAN AGENT:

MRS. CHARLES E. COCKEY, 1423 Linden Avenue, Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

Entered as Second Class Matter, July 18, 1931, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., under the Act of March 3, 1879 (Sec. 397, P.L.& R.).

The PROBLEM *of the* FUTURE LIFE

BY

C. J. SHEBBEARE, D.D.

Rector of Stanhope ; Chaplain to H.M. the King.

With a Preface by the Dean of St. Paul's

Demy 8vo, Cloth, 2s. 6d.

In this book Dr. Shebbeare deals with the difficulties which make it hard to conceive a Future Life in a self-consistent and satisfactory manner. He also seeks to state in simple and popularly intelligible language the philosophical grounds for the belief in man's survival of death and in our capacity to know in outline the character of such a Future Life as it is reasonable to expect.

BLACKWELL

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

All literary contributions should be addressed to :—

THE REV. H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D.

Ripon Hall, Boars Hill, Oxford

All orders for advertisements should be addressed to :—

A. Darby's Advertising Service

Cobham House, 24/26 Water Lane, London, E.C.4

(Telephone : City 6686-7)

Published on the 15th of every month except August and October. A Triple Number is published in September

READERS of the *Modern Churchman* are asked to support our advertisers, and to mention the *Modern Churchman* when replying to advertisements in our pages.

KNIT Socks for our men in the Forces on "Sunette" Knitting Machines, which obviate tedious hand knitting. Lists free. HARRISON, 48 (42) Upper Brook St., Manchester.

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 9. DECEMBER, 1939. Vol. XXIX.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

A Pacifist in Trouble.[1]

Dr. Inge has added another to his many volumes: it has the arresting title, *A Pacifist in Trouble*, and consists mainly of stimulating *causeries* republished from the *Evening Standard;* but its most significant feature is its Introduction dealing with the Dean's attitude towards the War. Principal Nathaniel Micklem, of Mansfield College, Oxford, castigates the Dean severely for this in the *Spectator* of December 1st. We are not sure that the Principal understands the Dean's style, which is marked by brilliant epigram, pungent criticism, startling antitheses, not by consistency and closely-reasoned exposition. We doubt if Dr. Inge in his Introduction is really expressing his considered convictions. The first impression that he gives is that he is a pacifist. He asserts that:

> 'Peace is the first, second and third interest of this country. We have nothing to gain by war and everything to lose' (p. 11). 'About the teaching of Christ there can be no doubt whatever' (p. 17). 'The Gospel of Jesus Christ condemns war and violence absolutely' (p. 16).

From such statements we should not unnaturally assume that the Dean is a pacifist in the sense that he is a conscientious

[1] *A Pacifist in Trouble,* by W. R. Inge, formerly Dean of St Paul's. (Putnam. 7/6. 1939.)

objector. If we so conclude, we shall discover that we are wrong, for in another passage the Dean writes :

> ' I should not like a son of mine to face a firing-party rather than fight for his country ' (p. 16).

We might also assume that the Dean is convinced that a Christian must obey the Sayings of Jesus Christ literally, yet we find him in this Essay deploring the fact that the War may deprive him of the power to leave any money to his children (p. 9). This indicates clearly that Dr. Inge does not regard it as a Christian duty to obey literally Christ's command, ' Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth.' Indeed, should anyone assert that it is a Christian duty to obey the recorded teaching of Christ literally, no one would condemn him more severely than Dr. Inge.

The general impression we derive from Dr. Inge's Essay is that he is not a pacifist any more than he is a militarist. His essay is not a reasoned argument for Pacifism, still less a declaration that he himself is a Pacifist, but merely a record of the Dean's moods and reactions in face of the present distress, an example of thinking, or rather of feeling, aloud.

May God Defend the Right !

In contrast to Dr. Inge's contribution to the ethics of the War is Principal Micklem's volume, *May God Defend the Right.*[1] He writes :

> ' The British cause, as I believe, is just and Christian ' (p. 28).

But he is painfully conscious of the terrible moral and spiritual dangers which beset the nation in *fighting* for it. We believe the sensitive Christian conscience will recognize the profound truth of his affirmations rather in the silence of the sanctuary than in the arena of the conflicting voices of political propaganda.

> ' First, as Christians we cannot directly and without qualification ask the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ to bless the bloody work on which we are engaged. War is the very opposite of God's will for man :
>
> The sad Face on the Cross sees only this
> After the Passion of a thousand years.

[1] *May God Defend the Right,* by Nathaniel Micklem, Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford. (Hodder & Stoughton. 3/6. 1939.)

But in penitence we recognize that we are so bound up in the sin of the social and international order that we had come to the point where no better alternative lay open to us as a nation, and we therefore pray God to forgive us, to accept our obedience, and to use it for His gracious and redeeming purposes. For, second and paradoxically, we see even in this war the will of God — not merely His will that in the circumstances we should enter upon it but, more deeply and generally, His will in that a civilization so godless, so secular, so merciless, so unbrotherly as ours must in God's moral order lead to disaster in the end. We recognize the judgment of God upon ourselves as well as on our enemies.

'Third, we pray that God Himself may win the war, and that the victory may be His, not ours, though, if it so pleases Him, it shall be through ours. The destruction of "Hitlerism" will be the victory of God, but "Hitlerism" is a poison in the hearts of men' (p. 40 *f*).

In his concluding chapter, Mr. Micklem writes:

'Every political question is at bottom theological. A false doctrine of man lies at the root of the Nazi heresy. Every political theory must have some implicit "anthropology.' Is man an automaton at the mercy of economic forces, or is he a spiritual being for whom life here should be but a preparation for a life to come: are all races and peoples of equal worth: is the purpose of the State to protect the individual or to protect society: what is the relation of the family to the State, and of the State to the world of nations and to the universal Church? All these political questions are also theological. Peace terms and the reconstruction after the war will inevitably rest upon some implicit "anthropology." We are not as Christians concerned with technicalities, but we are profoundly concerned that the reconstruction should be upon a Christian valuation of society and human life' (p. 124 *f*).

Unless our political, social, economic authorities can accept what for many of them must be this revolutionary hypothesis and base their future policies upon it, we can see no hope for a world-wide civilization in which mankind can find — we will not say a spiritual home (for here have we no continuing city) but at least a place of education and preparation for a higher life. Mr. Micklem writes:

'Even before the War there was an increasing impression that perhaps after all the Christian religion, and the Christian religion alone, had an implicit answer to the problem. War of itself is destructive only. We believe we are fighting for the conditions without which there can be no true civilization in Europe, but the War will have been but a catastrophic incident in the collapse of Europe unless a better order of society can be erected upon the foundation that it helps to lay. The reign of Christ in the hearts of men can never be furthered by the sword: in that sense we hesitate to say we fight for Christ, for he needs none to fight for him with earthly weapons: but we believe ourselves to be fighting not merely for the decencies of international

life but for Christian civilization on the continent of Europe. There is no peace for the world except in Christendom' (p. 126 *f*).

But he adds very justly what many ardent Christians ignore:

'A Christian spirit is not a substitute for technical skill and knowledge' (p. 127).

It is on the union of the Spirit of Christ with the methods and researches of modern science that the hope of the future welfare of humanity in this world depends. The trend of our modern civilization in Britain at least is to-day in that direction. A distinguished anthropologist recently remarked to a Cambridge psychologist as they were passing the Divinity School: 'We shall be in there within ten years.'

The Church and the War.

A third point of view is expressed in a letter written by Mr. Wyons Mauleverer, Vicar of St. Francis', Salisbury, which we publish in the correspondence pages of this issue. Mr. Mauleverer asserts that:

'The Church may rightly give her blessing to the *cause* for which we are fighting in so far as it is to defeat Hitlerism.'

He asks, however:

'How can she possibly give her blessing to the *method* used to promote that cause? The method of modern warfare with its scientific butchery, its callous indifference to the value of human personality, its definite reliance upon bomb, bayonet and torpedo is such a complete denial and reversal of the central Christian doctrine of the Cross, *i.e.* of victory and resurrection through self-sacrifice and suffering, that it is absolutely incomprehensible how so many good and sincere Christians can say that it is the lesser of two evils.'

We feel compelled to ask on our side: How are we to defeat Hitlerism without resort to the use of force? That is the crux. We have already confessed that the only justification of the war-method is that it is a lesser evil than that evil against which it is used. This is its only justification. If Mr. Mauleverer can indicate a more effective method of defeating Hitlerism than that which we are at present employing and one which is not open to the serious objections which attach to our present method, our leaders will be glad to know of it. We believe that every method, short of war, was tried by our leaders. But those methods failed.

It seems to us that a Church which can bless our cause but cannot bless the methods we are using to advance that cause, and yet is unable to prescribe any more desirable method which would prove effective, is bankrupt in leadership. If we are compelled, as rational and moral beings, to will a certain end, we are equally compelled, as moral and spiritual beings, both to will and to use the best available methods to achieve that end. It is constantly the case in this world that ideal ends have to be advanced, if they are to be advanced at all, by methods which in many respects fall short of the ideal end. The only justification for using these methods is that they are the best methods available. Bishop Butler has pointed out even in the case of the Divine Government how strange and unexpected and open to superficial criticism are the Divine methods used to accomplish the Divine ends. Some of our 'squeamish' idealists might do well to investigate, reflect on, and apply practically Butler's arguments to our present situation.

Mr. Mauleverer will not allow us to seek the Divine blessing, which means, we assume, pray for the success of the methods we are using.

We reply: If we can ask God to bless our cause, we can also ask Him to bless the methods we are using provided we are convinced that in our existing circumstances, they are the best methods available.

We venture to take exception to another point in Mr. Mauleverer's letter. He speaks with utter detestation and contempt of

> 'modern warfare with its scientific butchery, its callous indifference to the value of human personality . . . such a complete denial and reversal of the central Christian doctrine of the cross, *i.e.* of victory and resurrection through self-sacrifice and suffering . . . '

Surely this is only half the story. There is a very noble side to warfare waged in support of a great cause especially when, as in the case of our own nation, the rules of chivalry and humanity are honourably observed. Far from belittling human personality, the fighter who for a great cause is willing to give his life — and so offer the supreme sacrifice — is an example, not of the littleness but of the greatness of human personality and also of the truth and reality of the Christian Religion which is founded

upon the spirit of self-sacrifice for a great cause — the advance of the Kingdom of God upon earth.

Bishop Talbot on Police Action and War.

Bishop Neville Talbot, M.C., who served as a combatant in the South African War, and as a chaplain in the Great War, maintains in the *Church Times* (November 24th) as against Archdeacon Hartill the analogy between police action and war against aggression. This point is of crucial importance for the understanding of the existing situation, and Bishop Neville Talbot's cogent presentation of the case deserves citation.

> 'How elusive are the apostles of pacifism! Archdeacon Hartill first affirmed that the analogy between police action and war against an aggressor nation does not hold at all. Then he allowed, in deference to what I urged, that this was an exaggeration: and there he leaves it.
>
> 'But if there is any analogy at all, the pacifist position springs a leak; it will not hold water. In human society there must be forces of law and order to resist aggression against peace. With human nature as it is, this is a sheer necessity. Peace, let me repeat, is derivative from a state of law. It is, in Scriptural language, the fruit of righteousness. There is no avoiding this fact, whether within national communities or within the community of nations. That the analogy between police action and war is very far from close means that the rightness of the former is heavily compromised by the latter. But the stubborn facts of present-day real-politik make such compromise inevitable. It is sentimental or fanatical to hold that the application of the absolute ethic of the Sermon on the Mount to conditions prevalent in the international sphere can be without compromise.
>
> 'Compromise is an uncomfortable-sounding word. That is where the fanatics—the pacifists—come in, to protest against acquiescence in accepted compromises. But for the life of me, I cannot see that they have any policy to propose which is a real and practical alternative to resistance to aggression. And when pressed, they seem to me to run away. Yet such as I wish to learn from them!

Love, Joy and Peace.

Professor L. de C. Richardson in the *Birmingham Post* (November 27th), in discussing the well-meant advice to Christians to cultivate the spirit of 'Love, Joy and Peace' in wartime, points out that the sphere of cultivation is restricted to our personal relationships with God and one another, but of necessity excludes the international sphere. She writes:

> 'But what of love, joy and peace in the ordinary, fully-legitimate human sense, in the world at large? What of the witness of God in our hearts when we look upon the conditions of our fellow-men? What

of the millions tortured in mind and body, in Europe and in the East: of the blasphemies against God and Christ, of the education of the young in hatred and cruelty, of the deliberate preaching of lies to a whole nation—so successfully done in Germany that even on this side of the Channel thousands allow their whole reading of current history to begin with the Treaty of Versailles and forget that this Treaty itself was the result of the invasion of Belgium and of four years' oppression of that country—and a result incomparably milder than Germany's terms imposed on Russia at Brest-Litovsk? . . . In this fight there is a fundamental difference between Germany and us. She can stop the crime of war at any moment, by abandoning her attack, releasing her victims, making such reparation as is still possible to them; *we* cannot stop our war—for if we stopped it by non-resistance we should still further spread her rule, which is, over all the land she now commands, the systematic, fundamental and active negation of God.

'The choice before us is not between fighting Germany and converting her: it is between fighting her and being her accomplices.

'I hope that those earnest and well-intentioned Christians who fix their attention only on the evils of war will at least remember their responsibility. "If once," writes Hitler, "a propagandist allows even the slightest glimmer of light to be seen upon the other side he is raising doubt in the mind of the masses. The masses are not able to decide where justice ends and injustice begins. There must be no gradations, only positive and negative; love and hate; right and wrong; truth and lie; never the half and half." And again: "Every question of foreign policy can only be considered from this point of view: will such a solution be of advantage for our people now or in the future, or will it cause us damage? All considerations of internal politics, or religion, or humanity, in brief every other consideration whatsoever, must be pitilessly eliminated." We know that Hitler is a master of mass psychology; and we know in what sense he uses the term "advantage" in speaking of Germany's welfare.

'It seems to me quite certain that the principles of Christianity demand that we should fight this war to a successful conclusion. It seems to me quite certain that the men of our fighting forces and those of our home defences in every field of activity, each in his own measure, are doing immeasurably more to usher in that Kingdom of God which our Lord came on earth to establish than we who owe them our safety, our food, our clothes, our families, and yet find it in our hearts, without a thought of the alternative, to blame the task for whose accomplishment they are willing to sacrifice their all.

There is one point in this indictment which needs to be noted, the German negation of God is not verbal.

Principal Micklem cites in his book, *May God Defend the Right*, the following Nazi creed 'blazoned in enormous letters across a paper called *Schulingsbrief* . . . which circulates by the million among school teachers, Storm Troops, Labour Leaders, the Army and the Hitler Youth. The creed runs thus:

'Adolf Hitler, to thee alone we are bound. In this hour we would renew our solemn vow; we believe in this world on Adolf Hitler

> alone. We believe that National Socialism is the sole faith to make our people blessed. We believe that there is a Lord God in heaven, who has made us, who leads us, who guides us, and who visibly blesses us. And we believe that this Lord God has sent us Adolf Hitler that Germany should be established for all eternity.'

Hitlerism will not be rightly understood if it be regarded merely as a political policy.

It is a religion as fanatical, as fearless and as ruthless as was Islam in the seventh century. The advance of Islam in Europe was not checked by the conversion of Mohammedans and the passive resistance of Christians, but by the military forces of Martel the Hammer at Tours — a very disconcerting fact.

With Nurse Cavell we have come to realize that 'Patriotism is not enough.' Our experience at Geneva since the Great War has taught us that 'Pacifism is not enough.'

It is becoming increasingly clear to many that the only hope of permanent international peace is when the kingdoms of this world shall become the Kingdoms of our Lord and His Christ and that righteous war is a painful and needful preliminary to the securing of such a peace.

The Need for a Universal Religion.

It is a common complaint among our *intelligentsia* that there is at present no single philosophic system which is generally accepted by modern educated men. A higher synthesis of our various conflicting philosophic systems is ardently desired, but the philosophic genius who will provide it for mankind has not yet appeared.

Dr. Rashdall used to say, 'We are all of us philosophers, and some of us are very bad ones.' It is possible that the 'common people' possess to a very considerable degree a common philosophy, no doubt in some degree false and defective, which their superiors intellectually are unable to have the satisfaction of accepting. Human unity is certainly assisted by thinking together on the same lines and reaching the same conclusions. There are, however, other unifying factors in human life besides a common philosophy. And one of these, and we venture to think the most potent of all, is a common religion.

Religion creates a union of human spirits which is more profound and more binding than philosophic thought. That was

the view of a Victorian poet who appears to be regaining his influence with the British public. He was convinced that religion —the Christian religion—was a more potent influence in uniting mankind than any philosophic system could be.

'Our little systems have their day;
They have their day and cease to be:
They are but broken lights of Thee,
And Thou, O Lord, art more than they.'

Or again:

'And so the Word had breath, and wrought
With human hands the creed of creeds
In loveliness of perfect deeds
More strong than all poetic thought';

Religion draws men together by a common ideal of life, reflected in a common worship, which, in proportion to its sincerity, produces a common type of character and conduct.

'Men grow inly liker that they kneel before.'

It is by this means that human beings are profoundly, intensely and most satisfyingly united. Political re-arrangements, economic adjustments, the re-organizations of social systems cannot of themselves secure human unity. They have to be based on something more profound—a common religion. We are beginning to recognize to-day what some of the wiser members of our race recognized long ago, that 'Religion is the inner side of civilization'—its innermost inside—the most essential, as also the most characteristic thing about it. When the religion of a civilization dies, the death of the civilization speedily follows. It is a crisis of this kind that we have been witnessing for some time past in the Western world.

We are to-day in need of a new world-religion. This statement seems to be absurd, for a new religion is impossible. Every scientific student of religion knows that no religion is entirely new. It is in some degree based on and subsumes religions which have preceded it. A new religion is at once a recovery and a discovery: a recovery of religious values which have either been lost or neglected: a discovery that these values, imported into and adjusted so as to meet the needs of contemporary life, give that life a quality, a unity, a vitality, needful to raise it to its highest power. In our present crisis, the religion which we need to recover and discover is the Christian Religion

—'The Religion of Humanity,' as a great German student described it some forty years ago.

When we survey the surviving religions in the modern world we see that the Christian Religion alone has any hope of becoming universal—the unifying religious bond of the human race. The supreme reason for this is, as Auguste Sabatier insisted, that Christianity is not 'a religion of the letter but *the* religion of the Spirit.' That Spirit is the Divine Spirit in man with which he has been endowed by his Creator, and this endowment constitutes in man's experience, not merely a conservation of moral and spiritual values, but a potential and infinite augmentation of them. It is this extraordinary quality in the Christian Religion—the power of re-adaptation to a changing environment, combined with the power of infinite development—which, in the religious sphere, endows it with the promise of the future.

To-day the Christian Religion as presented by the great historic Churches of Christendom—Roman, Orthodox, Anglican, Lutheran, Evangelical Protestant, etc—seems hopelessly lacking in its power to unite humanity in a common bond of moral and spiritual fellowship. The existing Churches are so feeble and so disunited, so enslaved by the traditions and prejudices of the past, the limitations and conventions which they have inherited, and which they value as essential to their very being, that it would seem that little can be hoped for from them whilst they remain as they are.

But why should they remain as they are? It is their inhibitions, incrustations and misconceptions which paralyse them. If their religion be *the* Religion of the Spirit—the Creative Divine Spirit which can always create new organs and new agents to deal with new situations—they can free themselves from their fetters and reunite in the power of that Spirit. St. Paul thought of the Divine Spirit not only as the Spirit of love, truth and freedom, but also as the Spirit of Renewal (*anakainosis*), the Spirit which is ever making all things new. Hence all that shares in this Spirit is in a potential condition of renewal.

If the Christian Church possesses this Spirit of Renewal, it is able in this crisis to reunite itself and so to create the agency in this modern world which is an essential factor in uniting

humanity. If however the Christian Church has lost the Creative Divine Spirit as the source of its life and power, then the Christian Religion has reached a crisis when it must create a *Novum Organum* to embody its energy and to carry out the purpose for which that religion came into existence—the making of all things new in accordance with the Divine Ideal and the uniting of all men under the headship of the eternal Christ.

The solving of this problem in a practical way—and how much courage, wisdom, love, the solution demands from the Christian leaders of every Church—is the supreme contribution which at the present time our Christian Church ought to make, not to the winning of the war, but to the winning of the permanent and universal peace which we hope will follow it.

THE SPIRIT OF MAN AND THE SPIRIT OF GOD (I) *

By the Right Rev. J. W. Hunkin, D.D., M.C., Bishop of Truro.

'But there is a spirit in man,
And the breath of the Almighty giveth them understanding.'
—*Job* xxxii, 8.

'Let thy good spirit lead me in the land of uprightness.'
—*Psalm* cxliii, 10.

FOR a hundred years we have been expecting a new Reformation. A new Reformation involves and requires a theological discovery or re-discovery. The Reformation of the sixteenth century turned on the re-discovery of the Pauline doctrine of Justification by Faith. On what will the new Reformation turn?

Ninety years ago Frederick Denison Maurice made a suggestion. In a letter dated May 26, 1849, he wrote:

> 'I cannot but think that the reformation in our day, which I expect is to be more deep and searching than that of the sixteenth century, will turn upon the Spirit's presence and life, as that did upon the justification by the Son.'

Maurice, of course, was only thinking of the Christian religion.

* The first of three sermons preached before the University of Oxford on Sundays November 5th, 12th and 19th, 1939. The second and third sermons will be published in the January and February issues.

But the new Reformation will have to take account not only of the Christian religion and of all religions. During the last ninety years the study of other religions has made great strides. In this advance the University of Oxford has played an important part Max Müller, appointed Professor of Comparative Philology here in 1866, was one of its pioneers; and three years ago Sir Sarpavelli Radhakrishnan was elected to a newly-founded Chair of Eastern Religions and Ethics, and his valuable book *Eastern Religions and Western Thought* appeared only this year. In his introduction Professor Sir Sarpavelli writes:

> 'It seems to me that in the mystic traditions of the different religions we have a remarkable unity of spirit. Whatever religions they may profess, the mystics are spiritual kinsmen.' [1]

The same affinity is noted by Miss Evelyn Underhill:

> 'Why,' she asks, 'do the Christian saint, Indian *rishi*, Buddhist *arhat*, Moslem *sūfi*, all seem to us at bottom men of one race, living under differing sanctions one life, witnessing to one fact?' [2]

William James in his famous Gifford Lectures (1901-1902) is still more emphatic:

> 'Saints,' he says, 'whether Buddhist, Christian, or Stoic, are practically indistinguishable in their lives.' [3]

But this is going too far, as Professor Oliver Quick points out in an illuminating paper in the *Journal of Theological Studies* (January, 1912) on 'The Value of Mysticism in Faith and Practice':

> 'Looking closer at the whole trend of Buddhist and Christian saintship,' he writes, 'we are struck by a difference. In the Christian Church we have a magnificent succession of more or less mystical personalities, who not only instituted religious orders, but also exercised a most important influence in practical fields, such as politics, education, and the care of the sick. On the other hand, oriental mystics, while leading pure and noble lives, tend to cut themselves off from men and to survey the world with a superior, though kindly, pity which can only withdraw from the evil it knows to be invincible. The difference lies really in the whole spiritual power breathing through these two types of life: the active power of the love of God on one side, and the passive stability of union with the All on the other. In other words, the Christian mystic is inspired by a better theology than the oriental. The Incarnation is a more fruitful principle than pantheism.'

[1] pp. viii, ix.
[2] *The Life of the Spirit and the Life of To-day*, p. 148.
[3] *Varieties of Religious Experience*, p. 504.

It seems to me that the evidence substantially justifies Professor Quick's contentions. And certainly a man's religious experience is not independent of his theology.

That part of our Christian theology which now most of all needs fresh examination is that which deals with the spirit of man and the Spirit of God. Important steps were taken in this direction during the war of 1914-1918 by a group of writers led by the late Dr. B. H. Streeter. Their results were published in September, 1919, under the title, *The Spirit: God and His relation to Man considered from the standpoint of Philosophy, Psychology, and Art.* In 'the scientific passion of truth for truth's sake,' and the 'supreme activity of the modern world . . . the effort to realize in practice the brotherhood of man,' these writers recognize the operation of the Divine Spirit and discover the track of the Spirit in various paths of life.

In these three sermons I shall endeavour very rapidly to go over the ground again and trace a clue that may enable us to adventure forward a little further. In the present state of our knowledge such an attempt to move forward must be tentative and even hazardous. But the attempt must be made. On all sides we are urged to make it: by such a champion of the older orthodoxy as Dr. Swete on the one hand, and by such an able representative of modern thought as Gerald Bullett on the other.

Dr. Swete:

> 'It is possible that modern life, as it escapes from the control of a crude materialism, may be led to seek the solution of its perplexities in the Christian doctrine of a Divine Spirit working in the world and in man; and that the Christian doctrine, on the other hand, may gain by contact with modern thought, as in the early centuries it gained by contact with Greek philosophy.'[4]

Mr. Gerald Bullett:

> 'When I hear the Apostles' Creed recited in an English church I find myself in a state either of clear dissent or of an assent so elaborately qualified as to be not worth giving. But in one sentence among those noble cadences I discover—in Boehme's phrase—"the hammer that can strike my bell." I believe in the Holy Ghost. No other form of words can express with equal perfection something that is, first, a dynamic fact of experience, and, second, a conception common to all the great religious philosophies. To what are we committed by accepting it?'[5]

[4] *The Holy Spirit of the Ancient Church*, p. 7.
[5] *Problems of Religion*, p. 7.

That is the subject of our present inquiry. I have divided it into three sections under the general title *The spirit of man and the Spirit of God*. As a heading for the first section I suggest the words 'From the Old Testament to the New'; for the second, 'From the beginning of the Christian era to the present day'; for the third, 'To-day.'

First, then, we shall briefly trace the conception of the spirit of man and the Spirit of God from the Old Testament to the New.

I.

In the Hebrew the usual word translated in our English version 'spirit' is *ruach*: in the Greek *pneuma*. In the Old Testament *ruach* occurs 378 times. The use of the word is very interesting. All through the Old Testament literature—in the earliest documents, in the pre-exilic prophets, in the post-exilic prophets and in the latest writings, like Job and Proverbs—the word is often used simply to denote the *wind*, not merely air, but air in motion. One example will suffice: *I Kings* xix, 11, 'a great and strong *wind* rent the mountains, but the Lord was not in the *wind*.' No less than 117 times in the Old Testament is *ruach* used in this sense. Similarly throughout the Old Testament *ruach* is sometimes used for *breath*—the breath of the mouth or nostrils: *e.g. Jeremiah* x, 14, 'there is no *breath* in a molten image.' This use occurs thirty-three times. In these usages *ruach* denotes something not psychological but material. We may compare our own English use of the word 'spirit.' We use the word of a certain kind of inflammable fluid, and speak of a spirit lamp, and so on.

In post-exilic times the word *ruach* is used psychologically in something over one hundred instances. Sometimes it is found in parallels to another Hebrew word, *nephesh*, usually translated 'life' or 'soul'; *nephesh* occurs in the Old Testament no less than 754 times, and in the Septuagint its usual rendering is *psyche*. Actually the usages of these two words overlap: but *ruach* is the 'term of higher dignity.' It is used for the stronger and higher activities of man's inner life for which *nephesh* would not be appropriate; *nephesh*, on the other hand, can be used

and is used for the merely animal life (bodily appetites, etc.) for which the term *ruach* would be inappropriate. Thus, for example, ethical qualities are predicated of *ruach*: *Psalm* li, 12, 'steadfast spirit'; *Psalm* xxxii, 2, 'in whose spirit there is no guile.' And in *Ecclesiastes* xii, 7, *ruach* plainly denotes the highest element in man: 'the spirit return unto God Who gave it.' With this we may compare the phrase in P (*Numbers* xvi, 22; xxvii, 16), 'the God of the spirits of all flesh.'

So far we have only considered passages in the Old Testament where the reference is to something either material or human. But in about 130 passages *ruach* is used of superhuman spirit—in most instances of the Spirit of God. And whereas the passages in which *ruach* denotes the spirit of man are confined to the later literature, those in which the reference is to the Spirit of God are found not only in post-exilic writings, but in the earlier as well: *e.g. I Samuel* x, 10, 'the spirit of the Lord rushed upon Saul.' Thus it would seem that the use of the theological term 'the Spirit of God' preceded the use of the psychological term 'the spirit of man.'

The heroic frenzy which came upon national champions and impelled them to astonishing exploits, and the impulse which drove the prophets to a special kind of utterance, were attributed by the Hebrews to *ruach Adonai*, the Spirit of Jehovah. Several examples of the former occur in the story of Samson in the book of *Judges*, for example xiv, 19:

> 'And the spirit of the Lord came mightily upon him, and he went down to Ashkelon, and smote thirty men of them, and took their spoil, and gave the changes of raiment unto them that declared the riddle. And his anger was kindled, and he went up to his father's house.'

Similarly xiii, 25; xv, 14, and so on. We have already mentioned an example of the latter (*I Samuel* x, 10). The whole passage is worth quoting:

> 'and it was so, that when he turned his back to go from Samuel, God gave him another heart: and all those signs came to pass that day. And when they came thither to the hill, behold, a band of prophets met him; and the spirit of God came mightily upon him, and he prophesied among them. And it came to pass, when all that knew him beforetime saw that, behold, he prophesied with the prophets, then the people said one to another, What is this that is come unto the son of Kish? Is Saul also among the prophets?' (*I Samuel* x, 9-11).

The reference here seems to be to some kind of prophetic frenzy.

But we note that it was accompanied by a change of character — 'God turned him another heart' (v. 9)—which takes up Samuel's prophecy in v. 6 that he should 'be turned into another man.'

Later, when the prophets became the great religious and ethical teachers of Israel they still spoke under the impulsion and inspiration of a power which seemed to come upon them and which they felt to be not themselves. So *Micah* (iii, 8):

> 'I truly am full of power by the spirit of the Lord, and of judgement, and of might, to declare unto Jacob his transgression, and to Israel his sin.'

Here the prophet's own normal consciousness is not superseded; his own judgment of moral and religious values remains, though certain overmastering convictions or impulses emerge in him. Revelation wells up from the hidden depths of his being. His perception of religious truth seems akin to what we call intuition. From our modern point of view, perhaps, we may say that such intuition comes to him through his experience of a life lived under the guidance of the Spirit of God. It is significant that the actual phrase 'the Spirit of the Lord' does not occur in *Amos*, *Hosea* or *Jeremiah*, or any Deuteronomic writer. Very likely the phrase was associated too closely in their minds with the prophetic frenzy of false prophets.

As Dr. Büchsel has pointed out, the prophet Isaiah is of decisive importance in the history of the idea of the Spirit.[6] His description of the future ideal King contains what is perhaps the earliest plain assertion of the conception of the Spirit of Jehovah as a power making for *goodness*. *Isaiah* xi, 2:

> 'and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord.'

It is also a power bestowing intelligence and artistic ability. In *Exodus* xxxi, 1-5, the skill of the craftsman Bezalel is attributed to the Spirit of God:

> 'And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, See, I have called by name Bezalel the son of Uri, the son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah: and I have filled him with the spirit of God, in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship, to

[6] *Der Geist Gottes im Neuen Testament*, p. 19, quoted by E. R. Bevan, *op. cit.*, p. 170.

devise cunning works, to work in gold, and in silver, and in brass, and in cutting of stones for setting, and in carving wood, to work in all manner of workmanship.'

This passage belongs to P.

Later still, the prophet Joel looks forward to the time when the aspiration of Moses recorded in *Numbers* xi, 29, will be fulfilled:

'Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, that the Lord would put his spirit upon them!'

Joel ii, 28, 29:

'And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: and also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my spirit.'

Here it is to be noticed that although the prophet says 'all flesh,' *i.e.* all mankind, in reality he has only Israel in mind. Other nations, unfortunately, are to be destroyed (iii, 2, 9-13).

In all these passages which speak of the Spirit of Jehovah, the Spirit seems to be regarded not exactly as Jehovah's personal presence, but as something proceeding from Jehovah and operating in men. *Ruach Adonai* is 'the manifestation in human experience of the life-giving, energy-creating power of God.'[7] In *Psalm* cxxxix, 7, however, we come very near the idea of the Personal Presence:

'Whither shall I go from thy Spirit?
Or whither shall I flee from thy Presence?'

Similarly *Psalm* li, 11:

'Cast me not away from thy Presence;
And take not thy Holy Spirit from me.'

Such a passage does seem to imply 'that in the Spirit Jehovah personally acts.'[8]

We also note that in these Psalms the Spirit of God is connected with the life of the ordinary God-fearing individual without any reference to exceptional gifts. So also *Psalm* cxliii, 10:

'Teach me to do thy will, for thou art my God:
Let thy good spirit lead me in the land of uprightness.'

[7] N. H. Snaith, in *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*, p. 11. (Epworth Press, 1937.)

[8] A. F. Kirkpatrick, in *The Cambridge Bible for Schools*.

But to return to the question of the nature of the Spirit: the highest degree of personification of the Spirit attained in the Old Testament is found in a late passage—*Isaiah* lxiii, 9, 10:

> 'In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them: in his love and in his pity he redeemed them; and he bare them, and carried them all the days of old. But they rebelled, and grieved his holy spirit.'

Here the term 'holy spirit' is analogous to the term 'angel of his presence.' This, as Dr. Skinner says,

> 'is a name for His highest sensible manifestation, and hardly differs from what is in other places called the *Angel of Jehovah*.[9] (*Cf. Exodus* xxxiii, 14, 15 with xxiii, 20-23.)

I think we can sum up the matter in a sentence taken largely from Dr. Edwyn Bevan.[10] The conception of the *ruach*, the wind-like power proceeding from God, as a kind of extension of God's activity away from Himself, was a way of combining the idea of God's distance from the world with the idea of His operation within the world. To think of the *ruach* as something personal in itself was easier, we may believe, because *ruach* meant not only wind, but the higher activities of mind and will in man. At the same time it must not be forgotten that the Old Testament terminology is not uniform. Thus in *Job* xxxii, 8, 'But there is a spirit in man, And the breath of the Almighty giveth them understanding,' we have *ruach*, as we should expect. But in *Proverbs* xx, 27, 'The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord,' the word is *nishmath* (*cf. Genesis* vii, 22), the very word used for the *breath* of the Almighty in the passage just quoted from *Job* (xxxii, 8).

II.

When we leave the Old Testament and come to what we call the Apocrypha we find little or no development of the conception of spirit, or Spirit, except in the book of *Wisdom*, and particularly in one important passage to which reference will be made a little later.

With regard to Spirit one quotation will be enough—from Judith's song of praise. *Judith* xvi, 14: 'Let all thy creation

[9] *The Cambridge Bible for Schools.*
[10] *Symbolism and Belief*, p. 179.

serve thee: for thou spakest, and they were made, thou didst send forth thy spirit, and it builded them.' In connexion with spirit there is the well-known verse in the Song of the Three Children (64): 'Ye spirits and souls of the righteous, bless ye the Lord.' Here it is disputed whether the reference is to the living or the departed. Little or no further development is to be found in the other writings collected by the late Dr. Charles under the title 'Pseudepigrapha.'

A phrase characteristic of the book of *Enoch* refers to Jehovah as 'Lord of spirits.' This phrase occurs in that book 104 times. The spirits meant are probably elemental incorporeal spirits — angels, spirits of the air, and so on.[11] In the *Psalms of Solomon* we find a reference which reminds us of the passage already quoted from *Isaiah*:

> 'God will make him (the Messiah) mighty by means of holy spirit
> And wise by means of the spirit of understanding, with strength and righteousness' (xvii, 42).

There is very little literature surviving in Aramaic, and *ruach* can still mean either wind or spirit. We pass to Greek literature. We naturally think first of Philo of Alexandria, a contemporary of our Lord. Philo makes comparatively little use of the term *pneuma*. The word occurs only about 116 times in all his voluminous writings; whereas *psyche* is found nearly 1,800 times.[12] But it is noteworthy that he understands from *Genesis* that God breathed into man's face a spirit (*pneuma*) of life, and man became a living soul. The use of the word *pneuma* here is striking, because the Septuagint of *Genesis* ii, 7 has not *pneuma* but *pnoen*. 'Man,' Philo says, 'becomes a living soul through the inbreathing of divine Spirit' (*Leg. All.* i, 12, 13).

The reason why Philo uses *pneuma* infrequently is probably to be found in the connotation with which *pneuma* is used in Greek poetical and philosophical literature. *Pneuma* as used by the Greeks meant something material, a kind of invisible substance or gas. According to some of the medical writings, for instance, *pneuma* (enclosed active air) accounts for various phenomena in the human body.

[11] N. H. Snaith, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

[12] Josephus similarly uses *pneuma* only 28 times but *psyche* more than two hundred.

The Stoics appear to have been responsible for making *pneuma* a current term for 'the conscious Divine Being diffused through all things.' *Pneuma* still, however, implies a material substance. It was probably not until the word was adopted by Jews and Christians to translate *ruach* that it was employed with a connotation which was spiritual in our sense of the word.[13] The *Book of Wisdom* gives us a most interesting example of this change of connotation in a Jewish context. In the great passage about Wisdom (vii, 22-viii, 1) the writer describes world-pervading Wisdom as *pneuma* and undoubtedly reproduces current Stoic language about *pneuma*; but he himself uses *pneuma* in the spiritual sense which belonged to *ruach*: not in the sense of material gas. *Pneuma*, too, he represents as sent forth from a personal God: not as being itself God, as the Stoic *pneuma* was. *Wisdom* vii, 22-25:

'For she that is the artificer of all things taught me, *even* wisdom.
For there is in her a spirit quick of understanding, holy,
Alone in kind, manifold,
Subtil, freely moving,
Clear in utterance, unpolluted,
Distinct, unharmed,
Loving what is good, keen, unhindered,
Beneficent, loving toward man,
Stedfast, sure, free from care,
All-powerful, all-surveying,
And penetrating through all spirits
That are quick of understanding, pure, most subtil:
For wisdom is more mobile than any motion;
Yea, she pervadeth and penetrateth all things by reason of her pureness.
For she is a breath of the power of God,
And a clear effluence of the glory of the Almighty.'

The fact is that the loftiness of the Jewish conception of God in His awfulness and transcendence spiritualized the idea both of *ruach* and of *pneuma* when *ruach* and *pneuma* were connected with the Deity. The holiness of God meant to the Jew

> 'His abode in some region higher than the world of men and His invisibility to eyes of flesh.'
>
> 'So that to attribute His activity in the world and His visible manifestations to something that was Himself and yet not quite Himself met an instinctive exigence of Hebrew religion.'[14]

This something that was Himself and yet not quite Himself was in popular Jewish thought divine *ruach*, *pneuma*.

[13] E. R. Bevan, *op. cit.*, p. 182.
[14] See E. R. Bevan, *loc. cit.*, p. 179.

The connexion between the transcendent God and the world was a problem which specially interested Philo, and it was to deal with that problem that he developed his theory of the *Logos*. The Logos doctrine of the Fourth Gospel is related to the Jewish-Hellenistic world to which Philo belonged. It is a mistake to assume close affinity between the Logos of St. John and the *Memra* of the Targums. *Memra*, as the late G. F. Moore showed, is not to be regarded as a being of any kind or in any sense.[15] It is a phenomenon of translation, not a creature of speculation. Nor is it employed to render such Hebrew phrases as the *Word of the Lord, the Word of God*. It is not a buffer-idea but merely a buffer-word, introduced in a circumlocution to avoid mentioning the word God in 'too close contact with His creatures.'

The *Logos* of Philo is a buffer-idea. God, as the absolutely perfect, cannot have direct contact with the material world. He acts upon the world through the intervention of an intermediary, the *Logos*: related on the one hand to the godhead and, on the other hand, the real life of the world we know. The *Logos* is the agency by which God reveals Himself and through which He created and operates upon the world. 'The question as to the personality of the *Logos*,' Dean Inge has written, 'is better undiscussed. Neither Philo nor any Greek cared to define personality, a concept which has no name in the Greek language.'

As the Stoics held that Reason in man is part of the Reason immanent in the world, so Philo taught that the spirit

> 'which forms the essence of man's rational soul is the impress of the Logos . . . the communicated divine idea . . . the share which each man enjoys of the universal Reason.' [16]

But we must not forget that Philo was academic and 'high-brow.' His ambition was to write beautiful literary Greek.

> 'Unlike Philo, the writers of the New Testament were, for the most part, little concerned to write literary Greek; they used the phrases which were the ordinary ones used by the Greek-speaking Jews in daily life.' [17]

We must not therefore look too much to Philo for light on the meaning of New Testament terms.

[15] *Judaism*, I, p. 418.
[16] J. Drummond, *Philo*, II, p. 215.
[17] E. R. Bevan, *op. cit.*, p. 184.

On the threshold of the New Testament, then, we may take the two texts which I read at the beginning of this sermon as indicating briefly the position reached. *Job* xxxii, 8 :

> 'There is a spirit in man,
> And the breath of the Almighty giveth them understanding.'

Psalm cxliii, 10 :

> 'Let thy good Spirit lead me in the land of uprightness.'

Man, as man, has within him spirit implanted by God.

> 'In spite of all appearances to the contrary,' says Professor Radhakrishnan, 'we discern . . . a growing realization that there is a secret spirit in which we are all one, and of which humanity is the highest vehicle on earth, and an increasing desire to live out this knowledge and establish a kingdom of spirit on earth.'[18]

'Let thy good Spirit lead me in the land of uprightness.' It is in this conviction and with this prayer that we strenuously oppose the Nazi-ism with which the German people appears to be so seriously infected. We cannot come to terms with its false and fanatical racialism and with its cynical disregard of uprightness. We may agree with Lord Halifax that it would not be wise at this point to attempt to define our aims in detail. The various factors at present are too tangled and the situation too obscure. All the more earnestly must we pray for the leaders of all the nations, and especially for our own : and we may use the familiar rendering of Miles Coverdale in the English Book of Common Prayer :

> 'Teach me to do the thing that pleaseth thee, for thou art my God :
> Let thy loving Spirit lead me forth into the land of righteousness.'

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Besides earlier studies we have :

1. E. de Witt Burton, *Spirit, Soul, and Flesh.* Chicago, 1918 (reprinted from A.J.T., 1913-1916.)
2. Hans Leisegang, *Der Heilige Geist.* Leipzig, 1919.
3. H. Wheeler Robinson, *Hebrew Psychology* in *The People and the Book,* ed. A. S. Peake. Oxford, 1925.
4. F. Büchsel, *Der Geist Gottes im Neuen Testament.* 1926.
5. H. Wheeler Robinson, *The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit.* 1928.
6. Edwyn Bevan, *Symbolism and Belief.* 1938. (Chapters vii and viii.)

[18] *Op cit.*, p. 33.

THE TWO NEWMANS

By F. H. Amphlett Micklewright, M.A.

THE nineteenth century produced two strands in its religious history. The one may be described as neo-Catholicism. Whatever remnants of sacramentalism and of ecclesiastical authority may have lingered on in the Church of England were gathered up and intensified by the Oxford Movement and the succeeding Anglo-Catholic activity. 'The Catholic Revival,' to use the term of Wilfred Ward, saw the Roman Church in England rise from an obscure and barely tolerated sect to a position of power in English life. The other strand may be named 'free religion.' The growth of such forces as were denoted by physical science, Comparative Religion, and Biblical criticism, produced a form of religion which refused all outward authority. By the middle of the century this movement tended to evolve into pure Theism. Later on, under such influence as that of T. H. Huxley, it was more generally 'agnostic.' On its Christian side, James Martineau and J. J. Tayler were among its prophets. It is not surprising that two such opposing strands should have co-existed in the same century. Goethe and the Romantic revival, Darwin and the age of science, illustrate the growth of widely differing cultures. But it is strange that one family should have embraced distinguished representatives of both movements. John Henry Newman must always stand as the typical representative of the Oxford Movement and of one side of 'the Catholic Revival.' Francis William Newman, the younger brother of the Cardinal, is in many ways an outstanding example of the type of religious belief produced by the collapse of outward and external authorities in religion.

The career of Cardinal Newman has often been chronicled. Born in 1801, he was educated at Trinity College, Oxford, and succeeded to a fellowship at Oriel College. As Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford, he helped to initiate the Oxford Movement. Although his father had 'freethinking' tendencies, his mother was a devout Evangelical, and Newman has left it on record that he all but owed his soul to the Commentaries of Thomas

Scott, an Evangelical text-book of the period. A feeling of the importance of tradition and of church authority had led him to adopt a high church position. The attacks of the episcopate upon the *Tracts for the Times* and a study of the Donatist controversy shook his faith in the Church of England. In 1845 he was received into the Church of Rome. His impression upon the religious life of England, which owed so much to his powers of preaching, was now at an end, until it reawoke in controversy with Charles Kingsley when his spiritual autobiography, the *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, added a classic work to theological literature. After some years of neglect and suspicion, he was raised to the dignity of Cardinal-deacon by Pope Leo XIII. Until his death in 1890, Cardinal Newman was connected for many years with the Oratory at Edgbaston. It is as a religious philosopher that he must claim a place in English theology, an ascription which directs attention to his two most important works. *The Development of Christian Doctrine* was published in 1846. He had commenced it as an Anglican, but it actually appeared after his reception into the Roman Church. In it, he argues that, whilst an original doctrinal deposit of faith was revealed to the Apostles, the full faith of the Church was developed by God as need required in a manner analogous to the unrolling of a scroll. *The Grammar of Assent*, which appeared a few years later, was an examination of the foundations of belief and contains his one original contribution to the philosophy of religion, 'the illative sense.' Any criticism of Newman must deal very largely with these two works, for, taken together, they examine the roots of religious belief.

The younger brother, Francis William Newman, had a very different life, even though it bore some striking parallels to that of the Cardinal. He too was preoccupied with religion; he likewise started his religious career as an Evangelical; he left the Church of England; he wrote a spiritual autobiography, *The Phases of Faith*, which rivals in charm and appeal the better-known work of the Cardinal. Born in 1805, he was educated at Worcester College, Oxford, and later became a fellow of Balliol. At Oxford, he began to diverge from his brother. His evangelicalism was weakened by sceptical doubts concerning immortality. Differences concerning baptismal regeneration led

to an open rupture which was never healed. Owing to his refusal to sign the Thirty-nine Articles, he never proceeded to the degree of M.A. From 1827 until the end of the following year a private tutorship in Dublin led him into close contact with John Nelson Darby, the founder of the Plymouth Brethren, and to a revival of Biblical Evangelicalism in his mental background. As a missionary in Persia, Francis Newman was impressed by the refusal of the Mohammedans to consider the Christian faith of the Brethren. First Calvinistic dogma, and then bibliolatry, perished in his mind. Returning from the East, he became a classical tutor at Bristol College. From 1840 for six years he was on the staff of Manchester New College, the Unitarian theological college, then situated at Manchester. In 1846 he became the Professor of Latin at University College, London, a post which he held until his final retirement in 1869. Francis Newman was deeply influenced by his colleagues, J. J. Tayler and Dr. Martineau, and became a devout Unitarian. In 1876 he joined the Unitarian Association, becoming its Vice-President in 1879, but he never seems to have resolved his old doubts concerning immortality, a subject upon which his opinion tended to shift throughout his life. Yet he was a firm Theist who upheld his religious views against both materialism and orthodox Christianity. His literary productions were numerous and ranged over a wide variety of subjects, including a large number of essays on religion. Most important of his works in the field of theology were *The Soul* (1849) and *Theism* (1858), a quaint work partly written in prose and partly in blank verse. *Phases of Faith* appeared in 1850 and was considered by the agnostic historian, A. W. Benn, as 'the most formidable attack ever made against Christianity in England.' His view of God found its sanction in an appeal to the conscience of mankind. In 1891 he wrote an illuminating book, *Contributions to the Early History of Cardinal Newman*, exact in criticism yet wanting in good taste. Francis Newman died in 1897. At the time of his death he was largely forgotten, having outlived, as Frederic Harrison suggested, the zenith of his power by forty years.[1]

The two careers are of abiding importance. Both brothers have left disciples. The one looked back, in a development of

[1] Frederic Harrison, *Realities and Ideals*, p. 390.

regression, to the Middle Ages. The other looked forward to the growth of rationality and to the victory of free thought. The Cardinal possessed powers of synthesis which occasioned his wide popularity. In an age when attempt after attempt has been made to secure a world-view, synthesis will always make its appeal. Such alone explains the grasp which the philosophy of Auguste Comte, essentially a second-rate mind containing a first-rate idea, secured over many eminent thinkers. Francis Newman had no such gift. His mind was purely analytical. He tended to pull down orthodoxy and then to seek a camping place among the ruins. It was this weakness which led to his restriction of influence, save among the highly cultured yet small circle of English Unitarians. But both careers suggest that they were fulfilling a constant demand in theology. Modern Roman Catholic apologetic appeals to this very element of synthesis in the name of Cardinal Newman. A vast amount of contemporary religion, lying partly outside the organised churches, would accept the main lines of thought suggested by his brother. The Modernist, inasmuch as he feels that he has a place within historic Christianity, will find both positions unsatisfactory, and yet, in the manner of Hegel, will desire a synthesis to the thesis and antithesis of the dialectic presented by the two Newmans.

The religious philosophy of the Cardinal might well be defined as fundamental scepticism dressed in the guise of essential faith. He based his Theism upon the postulate that the world is rational; his authority being that of the conscience, his one theological link with his brother and with Dr. Martineau. His basis of belief, together with his contrast between believing and reasoning, leads to the conclusion that belief and act cannot transcend the possibilities which may be reached by argument, and that an ability to think the opposite is the highest state of assurance possible of attainment. But, as Dr. S. H. Mellone has urged, such a theory requires to be supplemented. In point of fact, our beliefs do go beyond what we can prove by argument. Instinct leads to a trust in the rational experience of the human race, and, if such 'practical certainties' are trustworthy, their foundation lies in human experience.[2]

[2] S. H. Mellone, M.A., D.Sc.: *Leaders of Religious Thought*, Ch. 3. This valuable essay is revised and expanded in the same author's *The Price*

Newman made one significant departure from the theology of the Vatican Council which laid down, in true Thomist fashion, that a knowledge of God could be attained by the unaided human reason. His Evangelical background had suggested to him, however, the part played by intuition and emotion. Newman insists upon a state conducive to believing, 'the illative sense.' The feeling of certainty is 'indefectible.' Once again, Dr. Mellone has shown the weak spot in the argument. In such sciences as logic and mathematics, the axioms are attended with a feeling of permanence and inevitability. Yet this can be no test of truth, but a ground of utter scepticism, unless the further authority of reason and experience be invoked. In point of fact, experience has shown that axioms once regarded as permanent may change in the light of the spirit of a new age. Newman finally makes the claim that the spread of Christianity in the ancient world requires the assumption of a miraculous or anti-natural power. In thus cutting the knot, Newman has overlooked the fact that the social, political, religious, and moral condition of the ancient world was exactly such as to evoke the spirit of nascent Christianity. The argument illustrates the curious isolation of Anglican and Roman Catholic theology from the best secular knowledge of the time. Why should the spread of Catholicism be any more miraculous than that of Puritanism, or why, indeed, should the spread of either denote more than that of Islam in the seventh century? The arguments of Newman in *The Grammar of Assent* illustrate the further fact that he was a forerunner of the sceptical pragmatism of William James. For Cardinal Newman, 'to work' in the interest of the Catholic Church had become a test of truth, an argument which, even if it stood alone, would illustrate his essential scepticism.

The *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* was probably the most powerful attack ever made from the Catholic side upon the historic Protestant position of the Bible as the seat of authority in religion. Newman never lost his Evangelical reverence for the Bible, but he came to see that the view of the Bible as an infallible source of religious doctrine, which the

of Progress (Lindsey Press, 1924), *cf.* Dr. Martineau's criticism of Cardinal Newman as a philosopher, 'His certainties are on the surface, and his insecurities below' (*Essays, Reviews and Addresses*, I, p. 234).

Evangelicals held it to be, was untenable. 'The letter' of the Bible must be understood, and to seek to do this gives rise to many further questions.[3] In the *Apologia* he accuses orthodox Protestantism of applying a ready-made scheme of doctrine to the Bible, reading into it the dogmas which it desired to find there. The Bible itself gives no answer to questions concerning the Canon of Scripture or the limits of inspiration. Again, the authority of the Bible is a growing authority, caught up in the religious development from the prophets to Jesus. The work of the Apostles was to expand and develop the words of Jesus. Thus the Bible exists to prove doctrine which it is the business of the Church to teach and develop in accordance with existing needs.[4]

The legitimacy of development is to be proved by the unity of the idea with itself, through all ages and through every stage of development. The Church thus becomes the infallible guide to faith and morals. To make such a claim is in reality to commit rational suicide by surrender to a system, for the Church is itself caught up within the development and cannot therefore possess final authority. Newman himself admits that there is no point in history at which the development of doctrine has ceased, but he allows no room for the abrogation from time to time of old dogmas by new truth, although such sheddings may be illustrated in abundance from the history of Christian doctrine. Again, the whole idea of an infallible Church, fundamental to Newman's theory, is a late ecclesiastical development.

The religious philosophy of the Cardinal is clearly sceptical. Scepticism has, for its principle, the assertion that, whilst causes may be found for accepted beliefs, reason or adequate reason is lacking. The basis which Newman gives is that the infallible Church is the true measure of faith because the worshipper believes it to be so. The 'illative sense' stripped bare becomes no more than an act of sceptical pragmatism. The infallible Church merely means a claim of finality on behalf of one system of religious belief. It may be argued that Newman has supplied rationality to his apologetic viewed as a whole, but he has done so by making a practical denial of reason the first step in the

[3] J. H. Newman, *Essay on Development,* Ch. II, 1 & 2.
[4] J. H. Newman, *Ibid.,* Ch. V, end.

argument. It is only his treatment of the conscience which saves him from a scepticism as blank as that of Hume. The framework of the whole world, including man's mind, is rational in the deeper sense of the word. Laws and principles of thought must be rational, for that which is irrational could not survive. 'But such a faith in the rationality of the whole is a desperate leap in the dark unless we can find some traces of rationality in the parts,' and this Newman finds in his treatment of conscience, the indwelling voice of God, as he defined it in the *Apologia*.[5] Sin and failure need to be regarded in the light of experience as a whole. The voice of conscience shows the world as so evil that it could only be saved by the miraculous intervention of God.

All of the weaknesses of the theory of development as a means of bridging over the gulfs created by religious intuition and insight are present in this argument. Newman had turned development into a regression which leads logically to the Middle Ages. But, once 'the illative sense' is abandoned as a self-evident truth, agnosticism is the next logical step. Tyrrell picked up the idea of development from Newman, but showed that, when explained in terms of Darwinianism, it led to very different results. Even though the rebellion of Dr. St. George Mivart was impelled by his study of physical science, his *technique* was Newman's. It was Newman who gave to Alfred Houtin his first lesson in scepticism.[6] The basis of Newman's faith, the witness of the conscience to God, remains undisturbed by these expansions of his fundamental argument, but his developed position is shaken into ruins. The Cardinal had shattered Bibliolatry, but his own authority, an infallible Church alike breaks down. The witness of the conscience as the final ground for the knowledge of God would seem to demand that the resulting religious philosophy should be developed in another direction."[7]

Both Catholicism and orthodox Protestantism have been affected by these criticisms, but, in his *A Retrospect of Religious Life in England*, J. J. Tayler urged that there is a third important group in Christian cultural history, the liberal or free

[5] *Cf.* S. H. Mellone, *The Price of Progress*, p. 110*f*.

[6] A. Houtin, *The Life of a Priest*, p. 96*f*.

[7] *Cf.* an illuminating work, R. A. Armstrong, *God and the Soul*.

thinking. This is well represented by the theology of Francis Newman. He had left the Church of England for reasons exactly opposed to those of his brother. He found it too Catholic and too sacerdotal. He had renounced Calvinism and then the 'religion of the letter.' His study of Christian origins gave to him a strong anti-Pauline bias. His enthusiasm for the rising Biblical criticism made him a powerful opponent of all Bibliolatry. He detached his religion from history and found the voice of God in the conscience. The claims made by Jesus for himself caused him to regard the Christian position as uncertain. Newman, however, made more of Jesus than did such a Theist as Charles Voysey, and regarded Him as a teacher of pure, inward religion of a spiritual kind who was put to death for claiming to be a royal prince. The Lord's Prayer sums up the free unsectarian faith of Jesus and gives the essence of His spirit.[8] But he refused to regard Jesus as being in any sense the centre of religion.[9] It was on this point that Francis Newman refused to follow his friend, Dr. Martineau, in regarding Jesus as a figure demanding religious veneration.[10] In so far as Newman accepted any organization or religious society, he desired to see it established upon a purely ethical basis,[11] whilst his *A History of the Hebrew Monarchy*, published in 1847, anticipated Bishop Colenso in his free treatment of the traditions of the Old Testament. Francis Newman agreed with his brother that the Bible had developed, but he made no attempt to relate it to the idea of a developing Church. He was interested to show how it developed and to check the valid nature of such development by the dictates of conscience and of reason. Dean Stanley regarded *The Soul*, published in 1849, not only as Francis Newman's outstanding work, but as worth more than any writing of the Cardinal.[12] In it, the sense of the infinite, the sense of sin,

[8] F. W. Newman, *The Hebrew Prince* (1895). It is interesting to compare this estimate of Jesus with that contained in Charles Voysey's *The Testimony of the Four Gospels to Jesus Christ.*

[9] F. W. Newman, *Against Hero-making in Religion* (1865).

[10] Weinel and Widgery, *Jesus in the Nineteenth Century and After*, p. 191, *cf.* Jas. Martineau, *Endeavours after the Christian Life, Hours of Thought,* and *The Seat of Authority in Religion.*

[11] F. W. Newman, *A Plea for Catholic Union* (1844).

[12] *Life of Miss F. P. Cobbe,* p. 97.

and the belief in a future life are considered from the standpoint of constructive Theism. He pleads for 'spirit' as opposed to 'form' in religion. The work ends with a chapter on 'The Prospects of Christianity,' pleading for reason and understanding and condemning authority of an external kind as the bane of Christendom.[13] The author had good cause to know the evil of such authority, whether it be manifested in Romanism, Calvinism, or Brethrenism. His contact with Muslims in Persia had shattered his faith both in religions of authority and in the exclusiveness of Christianity. In *Theism*, which appeared in 1858, Newman bases his religious faith upon God as being the common foundation of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam alike. He had now reached a position in which Christianity at best could be no more than a sub-section of Theism. He had come to regard the early Christian estimate of Jesus as profoundly influenced by the *Book of Enoch*, a view which has since met with a widespread acceptance. To him the primitive Church was guilty of literary forgery, whilst St. Paul had corrupted the simple gospel of Jesus by his doctrine of the Cross.[14] In his book upon his brothers' career he notices the Cardinal's weakness with regard to first principles in theology,[15] and ends by appealing to Protestants on behalf of theological freedom.

The essential weakness in Protestantism was exposed by Francis Newman. Reason is neglected and, whilst much is made of private judgment, the conclusions are prescribed.[16] There is undoubtedly much truth in this claim. If reason is to be allowed as a check upon the emotions and intuitions of the conscience, it must be allowed free play. The neglect of this by historical Protestantism had produced a situation in which the

[13] F. W. Newman, *The Soul*, p. 161.

[14] F. W. Newman, *Christianity before and after Paul of Tarsus* (1894).

[15] F. W. Newman, *Contributions to the Early History of Cardinal Newman*, p. 44 *ff*. A good summary of F. W. Newman's conception of theological freedom is contained in *Religious Thought in England in the Nineteenth Century*, by John Hunt, D.D., p. 256 *ff*.

[16] *Cf*. F. W. Newman, *The Religious Weakness of Protestantism* (1866). A thoughtful 'Liberal Evangelical' reply to F. W. Newman is contained in V. F. Storr, *Development of English Theology, 1800—1860*, pp. 374-378. Canon Storr points out that F. W. Newman was essentially a mystic with an anti-dogmatic basis. He passed through various 'phases' which cause his critical writings to lack a thoroughgoing consistency in detail.

difference between Catholicism and Protestantism merely meant the opposition of two sets of dogmas both erected upon inadequate foundations. Calvin certainly did not stand for freedom. Luther treated reason as 'the devil's dumb dog.' Francis Newman had experienced the weakness of Evangelical Protestantism. Reason was bounded by a rigid orthodoxy. He exchanged Calvinism for the 'primitive Christianity' of Darby and the Brethren, only to find it one of the most rigid systems which Protestantism has ever produced. His revolt became one against the authority of dogma. Although the 'Jesus or Paul' controversy has taken vastly new forms since Newman wrote, it must be allowed that his attitude towards Paul is largely justified. The Pauline dogmatism upon the pre-existence of Christ and his lack of interest in the earthly Jesus, together with his stress upon a substitutionary atonement, has done much for theological creed-breeding and little for ethical religion. His tendency to exalt dogma above the free rights of conscience justifies many of the things which Newman wrote both of him and of such religious development as Paul exemplifies.

The position of Francis Newman with regard to Jesus was somewhat characteristic of advanced liberals of his day. Jesus was a great man but no more. The Christological controversy has since developed along the lines marked out by Martineau, with its place for the veneration of Jesus, rather than along those of Newman. Jesus, if the records are to be given any serious consideration, refuses to be relegated to this subordinate place. He appears as the type of the universal incarnation of God in man at its highest. Martineau traced out the weak point of Newman's lack of Christology; he set too high a standard by which to test a human historical figure.[17] He was too apt, with the Evangelicals, to sever the religious and the secular. He did not allow sufficiently for the influences of the first century on the thinking of Jesus. Francis Newman was too ready to succumb to the philosophical temptation to detach his Theism from history. Such religion tended to pass over into philosophical theory. Newman, like Voysey, was set hopelessly wrong by the system in which he had been brought up. He could not see Jesus, as

[17] *Cf.* correspondence between F. W. Newman and Dr. Martineau; Drummond and Upton, *Life of Jas. Martineau,* I, 136-141.

Martineau, foreshadowing a later epoch in theology, saw Him. The discrediting of the Christ of Calvinistic dogma led him into a coldness towards all Christology.

Yet Newman's theism affords a valuable basis for all religion. It prevents Christianity from passing off into the mere 'Jesus-worship' of the Church of Cardinal Newman or of *Hymns, Ancient and Modern*. Francis Newman had refined the holiness of God, a legacy of his Calvinist days, into the basis of a theology of abiding value. He recalled thought to the first principle of all theology, that of belief in God, even though he failed to relate the act of God to history. He never worked out a theory of revelation wider than that of his view of the conscience, and this formed his weakness. In Christian theology a consideration of what is meant by revelation cannot be passed over in silence.

Both the Cardinal and his brother were interested in the deeper problems of religion; both sought to relate these problems to human reason, but the Cardinal, by an adroit use of scepticism, utilized them in favour of religious reaction, whilst Francis Newman marked out a course which the future is taking increasingly. The rise of scientific agnosticism tended to obscure Francis Newman for the next generation, whilst his own diffusion of his energies weakened him as a teacher. But his real weakness was that he made no attempt to synthesize his results. He had done much to destroy the false ideas of religion current in the middle of the last century; but he had made no effort to rebuild. Frederick Harrison was probably correct in asserting that the power of synthesis gave to the Cardinal a moral superiority over his brother.[18] Yet the Cardinal had failed to see that the growth of the scientific temper made the isolation of theology impossible and that modern knowledge must play its part in the synthesis. The failure of Francis Newman is a warning that criticism must be linked with construction. When traditional views of authority have broken down, the need of the age has become that of a construction of Christianity in terms of the free rights of the conscience and reason.

One further question arises. The Cardinal left the Church of England because it was too Protestant, Francis Newman because it was too Catholic. Neither understood its true message.

[18] Harrison, *Ibid.*, p. 394.

Both identified the Church with sectarian teachers instead of pointing to her ideals and to her spirit of comprehensiveness as denoting her true character. The vision of a broad national Church, such as possessed the tolerant spirit of Bishop Colenso or of Dean Stanley, provided the necessary framework of a modern synthesis which should link the interest in tradition shown by John Henry Newman with the desire for freedom evinced by his younger brother. But the two careers illustrate the scepticism which must underlie all religions of external authority and the necessity for the final victory of freedom and truth in religious belief. In spite of the power of transitory reputations, and even though modern religion would adopt a higher view of Jesus, it is Francis Newman who in reality has triumphed over the Cardinal because he refused to subjugate conscience and veracity to any ecclesiastical system, whether of Catholicism or of Evangelicalism.

BOOK REVIEWS

LIBERALISM AS DOCTRINE AND AS DOGMA*

By the Rev. Alan Richardson, M.A., Study Secretary of the Student Christian Movement.

Mr. Demant's new book,* *The Religious Prospect,* raises important questions which demand the attention of all who are concerned about the future of religious and social life in Britain, Europe and the world. It is described in the preface as 'an essay in theological prophecy.' Although it does not make easy reading, it cannot be overlooked, because it is the work of a sensitive and able mind which is grappling courageously with the crucial problems of our day. It was written shortly before the outbreak of hostilities, but its author was so keenly alive to the trend of European events during the last few years that it loses nothing of its relevance to our present situation.

Mr. Demant makes a careful investigation of what is meant by 'liberalism,' and it is important to understand precisely how he is using the term. He distinguishes between liberalism as a *doctrine* and liberalism as a *dogma*. He says:

> 'I use the term "doctrine" for consciously-held theories, and the term "dogma" for the assumptions that are taken for granted as the absolutely right way of looking at reality' (p. 20).

* *The Religious Prospect.* By the Rev. V. A. Demant, M.A. (Fred. Muller Ltd., 1939. 7/6.)

Dogma is thus what is now often called ' unconscious ideology ' or what T. E. Hulme called ' categories ' — the spectacles of our habitual mental attitudes, through which we see everything.

In the second chapter Mr. Demant analyses the four main ' positive notes ' in consciously affirmed liberal *doctrine* throughout the last two centuries. (1) There is first the belief that the human mind is capable of eliminating bias and reaching objective truth; this belief is the opposite of the present-day view that all human thinking is merely relative and is determined by the ' sociological ' position of the knower (*cf.* Karl Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia,* Kegan Paul, 1936). On this belief is based the liberal emphasis upon the faculty of reason and upon the necessity of individual freedom of speech, of research and of the press. (2) Then there is the belief that disinterestedness is possible in the pursuit of moral values, and that there exist objective standards of rightness; might is therefore no criterion of right. (3) This involves the belief in the existence of a Natural Law which exists independently of its embodiment in any extant state of legislature: the Law is above the state and may not be manipulated by the state to serve the ends of the ruling class. (4) Underlying these three beliefs is a fourth, that there is an essential human nature which cannot be defined in terms of the relative position which the individual holds or the function which he performs in the social organism. Man brings something to his social relationships and is not completely a product of them; hence there is implied belief in a democracy in which everyone participates to some extent in the function of government. ' Human life in its totality cannot be subordinated to a political end ' (p. 37).

How is it that these liberal doctrines, so widely held until a generation ago, are repudiated by the dominant political philosophies of to-day and questioned by many whose hopes have been disappointed? The answer to this question is revealed by an examination of the liberal *dogma* which has been the accepted ' category ' of modern thought since the Enlightenment. In Chapter III Mr. Demant argues that liberalism as a *dogma* has maintained that there is no other dimension than the temporal flux of becoming. ' The moving process of history, being the whole of reality, carries with it its own truth ' (p. 57); the movement of history (called ' progress ' or ' evolution ') guaranteed the ultimate attainment of the ideals of liberal doctrine. But the liberal dogma of the abstract individual was discredited by the events of the Great War and the following years; it had not provided the modern man with that positive relationship with some super-individual whole for which human nature craves. The totalitarian philosophies, which substituted the collectives of class or nation or state for the abstract individual, arose to supply that religious need which the older liberalism had failed to provide. Thus the liberal dogma of the abstract individual led to the totalitarian assertion of the State as the denial of the individual. Kant paved the

way for Hegel. The liberal belief that perfection of being is something to be realised within the cosmic process of becoming itself gave rise to vitalistic philosophies which make human salvation a matter of collective action. Mr. Demant has many illuminating things to say about Marxism, Fascism and Nazism, and he has obviously made a deep study of the philosophies underlying these movements. They still operate within the framework of the liberal dogma of becoming, and the religious dynamic which they possess is due to the conviction with which men believe the dogmas underlying them.

> 'There is a close connection between the power of totalitarian movements as historic forces and their dogmatic outlook upon existence. Their power lies in an induced faith that . . . men are instruments of a world purpose. The Marxist declares freedom to be the consciousness of necessity and sees Communism as a trend through which men participate in the universe's march to its inevitable goal. For the Fascist the national deed has the force of a deity that generates and judges men's acts and thoughts: the German Nazi finds himself the bearer of a racial destiny that is the meaning of existence' (p. 123).

Thus the totalitarian philosophies are based upon the liberal *dogma* of becoming, but they have renounced the original liberal *doctrines*. Mr. Demant holds that liberal doctrine cannot in fact be supported by liberal dogma but only by a return to the classical dogma of Christianity, the dogma of being, of man's relationship to God. Christianity, if it is to become again the bearer of the values of liberal doctrine, to which it originally gave birth, must have its own *dogma*: it will not be enough to offer it as advice, or to point to the superiority of its morality. It must oppose its dogma of being to the liberal-totalitarian dogma of becoming.

What kind of Christianity will it be that can sustain the values of the liberal doctrine which the liberal dogma has proved itself unable to sustain? In Chapter VII Mr. Demant urges that it will be a Christianity which stresses the double relation of kinship and contradiction between man and God, of dependence and alienation, of Creation and Fall. Two kinds of Christian interpretation are ruled out by the acceptance of this view: (1) 'Barthianism,' which destroys this tension by absolutizing the 'otherness' of God from the world, and (2) Liberal Christianity, which destroys it by 'immanentizing' the divine within the processes of history.

> 'For the actual work of living in the world, the dogma that all is equally under the divine "No" is as useless as the dogma that all is equally under the divine "Yea." In either case man has to find his criteria of judgment and action from some source extraneous to his central religious conviction' (p. 181).

Luther had to entrust the affairs of this world to the princes; his successors have to entrust them to 'the experts.'[1] Dr. Rosenberg and the liberal

[1] The present writer may perhaps be permitted to say that Mr. Demant's attribution of such views to the Student Christian Movement to-day is more untrue than unkind (p. 183, footnote).

Christians have to judge world-process from the same standpoint, from within the processes of history itself. The former appeals to racial consciousness, the latter to 'our rational, moral and spiritual consciousness,' but both operate within the framework of the liberal dogma of becoming and its denial of a transcendent reference. The Incarnation is no longer a fixed, objective, final fact, which in some sense transcends the flux of becoming as a revelation which comes into history from beyond it; 'Christ is understood as the high-water mark of the cosmic tide out of which He emerged' (p. 203). Mr. Demant at this point crosses swords with Dr. Major on the question of Christology (p. 203, *f.*); whether he has correctly interpreted Dr. Major's views is a question which can be more adequately answered by the Editor of the *Modern Churchman,* should he think it worth while.

It is at this point that members of the Modern Churchmen's Union would do well to study Mr. Demant's views with careful attention. It is precisely here that they will find a divergence of opinion within their own ranks. The present writer agrees whole-heartedly with Mr. Demant's view that within the framework of what he calls the liberal *dogma* the true values of Christian (and authentic) liberal doctrine cannot be maintained and the true insights of the biblical revelation of man's relation to God cannot be expressed. A new expression of the classical Christian conception of God and man is needed to-day, in which the incompatibility between the Christian and the liberal 'dogmas' will be clearly demonstrated. Others will disagree. At any rate, this question is urgent and calls for honest discussion between the upholders of the rival views. Mr. Demant has at least performed a great service by posing the question so clearly and bringing its various implications to light.

But at this point the present writer regretfully parts company with his guide. Mr. Demant is a 'definite Catholic,' and he identifies the Christianity which he believes must be the ground of the authentic liberal values with Catholicism as such. This is a pity, because it prevents Mr. Demant and the school of thought of which he is the able spokesman from giving the lead which is needed across all the denominational frontiers, and it makes him appear (falsely) as the champion of a merely sectarian cause. Mediaeval expressions of Christian truth, however urgent it may be that the latter should be stated, are not likely to make a wide appeal to the modern mind or to stem the advance of the dominant political philosophies of to-day. But there is a more serious objection to the view that Catholicism as such has been or can be the bearer of the liberal values. In many parts of the world to-day Catholicism is the bitter enemy of those values; Franco's Spain must surely cause Mr. Demant to hesitate in making his claim for Catholicism. One wonders whether he maintained 'neutrality in thought' during the Spanish civil war. A reading of the Clarke Papers (*cf.* A. S. P. Woodhouse,

Puritanism and Liberty, Dent) might suggest to us that a different atmosphere was, as a matter of historical accuracy, necessary to the birth of the democratic values. History, one feels, is not on Mr. Demant's side.

If you cannot agree with Mr. Demant's claim that a 'Catholic revival' is the only way in which the Christian liberal values can be safeguarded, is there no other type of Christianity which will avoid the Scylla of 'Barthianism' and the Charybdis of 'liberal Christianity,' and which will, in fact, be nearer to the essential genius of the English Church? Could there not be a Christianity which is not tied down to mediaeval forms of expression, which could at the same time stress the very important truths which 'Barthianism' has re-emphasised (*e.g.* justification by faith), and which perhaps Mr. Demant is in danger of overlooking? Could there not be a Christianity which had climbed right out of the morass of the liberal *dogma* of 'becoming' by finding a firm foothold in the biblical revelation of the nature of God and His relationship to men? Could not such a Christianity, definite but free, dogmatic but not static, become once again the source and inspiration of a 'new Christendom' in which the authentic liberal values were restored and regenerated?

FAREWELL TO OXFORD *

We understand that Mgr. Knox has left Oxford, and that he has gone into retreat, like Luther after the Council of Worms, to produce a new translation of the Bible, or rather of the Vulgate, which is to supersede the Authorised Version and to play an important part in bringing back England into the Roman fold. Dr. Johnson in his imitation of Juvenal's Third Satire represents his friend Savage as hurling a denunciation at the town which he is just leaving. Mr. Knox writes in a more genial vein, more genial, perhaps, than is his wont.

The title is a plagiarism, perhaps unconscious, from *Punch*, which at the beginning of the American Civil War urged the citizens of the United States not to imitate the everlasting dog-fights of the South American Dagoes:

'Let Dons delight
To rave and fight.'

Our author parodies the same poem of Dr. Watts:

'Your little hands were never made
To tear each other's eyes—
You'd do it better with the aid
That mustard gas supplies.'

One Sunday evening he was invited to the High Table at Simon Magus College. Under the influence of the port and the brilliant talk he falls asleep and experiences a number of visions; he revisits the common room at inter-

* *Let Dons Delight.* By Ronald Knox. (Sheed & Ward. 1939. 7/6.)

vals of half a century, beginning with the year of the Spanish Armada, and listens to the conversation. In 1588 the Fellows of the College are waiting to see which side is going to win and are ready to be Papist or Protestant as the winds and the waves and the tactics of Sir Francis Drake may determine. There are two exceptions among these academical weathercocks, a sour Puritan who subsequently drowns himself and a noble Catholic who becomes a seminary priest and earns the crown of martyrdom. It is not a very hopeful beginning; the bias is too obvious. It almost suggests the extracts from the conversations between Mr. Barrett and his admirers, which, wherever they start, always end in the advantages of well-fitting footwear.

It is a pity, for when Mr. Knox can manage to keep the Pope's tiara out of his Memorials of the past he can be both shrewd and entertaining. It is no easy matter to counterfeit the style and expression of a past age; a single slip is apt to produce a jarring sense of incongruity. We are not satisfied with the Elizabethans, but the seventeenth century symposium is good, the imitation of the style of the eighteenth century almost impeccable, and the slang of the Early Victorian period is hit off very well. Here is a fragment from the conversation of 1638:

> 'Tut, Sir, that is but a figure. The scripture bids us work out our own salvation with fear and trembling, Philippians two and twelve. Yet would you think me crazed in my wits if you saw me shaking at the knees and shivering like one that hath the ague, as often as I came into the chapel here, and protesting I would be damned if I did not work myself into a St. Vitus's dance.'

And there is a jolly Don of the Restoration who thinks that there is no book like *Hudibras* whom we should very much like to have sat next to.

There is a very respectable imitation of a conversation between Boswell and Dr. Johnson about a Papist who turned Whig:

> 'Boswell. Then he was doubly a renegado, both when he embraced the Roman Catholic religion, and when he abandoned it.
>
> 'Johnson. No, Sir, a man must follow his conscience. If he was sincere when he embraced that way of thinking, he did no wrong then; if insincere, he did no wrong when he abandoned it; you must not make him out to be doubly a scoundrel. But he was a scoundrel for all that.'

We also like the comment of the fashionable guest in 1788 who is wearied with theological discussion:

> 'The doctrine of the Trinity is not much canvassed in the polite world nowadays.'

In 1888, when the Victorian world, though it knew it not, was sinking into senility, the Dons of Simon Magus discuss the continuity of Oxford. When, we may ask, did the spiritual idea emerge for which the name of this town in the South Midlands stands, and how long will it last? Has it, perchance, vanished already? The little mediaeval cluster of houses which

gathered round the Norman Castle, a fragment of which still frowns over the seat of learning and of the Motor Trade, was not what we mean by Oxford. No more was, we think, the offshoot of the University of Paris which flourished in the same spot in the later Middle Ages. Oxford, we are inclined to think, began with the Renaissance; it is associated with the growth of Anglicanism; its golden age was the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; in the nineteenth century it was the home of lost causes; and in the twentieth it was occupied by the Barbarians. We are not sure if this is the conclusion that Mr. Knox means us to draw. Probably he would agree that the cosmopolitan Babel where Rhodes scholars rub shoulders with the countrymen of Tagore is not the spiritual home of Laud or Johnson or Newman. It may be magnificent, but it is not Oxford.

GAMALIEL MILNER.

EVOLUTION AND ITS MODERN CRITICS*

A most interesting and well-written book, which guides the reader who has only a general scientific knowledge through the intricacies of the specialised studies of Zoology and Palaeontology. While serving as a survey of recent work on Evolution, the book is largely concerned to meet the objections of certain critics of the whole evolutionary position. These critics are not theologians, as might have been expected fifty years ago. On the face of it, their objections are purely scientific, and in some cases are supported by a meticulous collection of evidence. But on examination the arguments used prove to be dishonest, *i.e.* they are not the arguments which convinced the critics themselves. Dishonest arguments can generally be detected by the treatment of the evidence, *e.g.* withholding essential and well-known facts, and attacking, as parts of the accepted theory, views held by no one. One is forcibly reminded of the very similar critics of Biblical research. A recent writer, for instance, argued that writing was well known in the days of Moses, as if it was on such grounds that scholars deny the Mosaic authorship of the Torah. Dr. Davies goes to considerable trouble to deal with the adversaries, and their arguments are smashed every time. Just in the same way, any good book on the Old Testament, from Driver's *Genesis* onwards, smashes the arguments of the Fundamentalists. It may seem strange that Fundamentalists are still to be found; and we would not mind wagering that Dr. Davies will find the adversaries of Evolution completely unperturbed by the destruction of their arguments. The fact is that in both cases there are presuppositions which are quite independent of the arguments put forward, and incapable of proof. No doubt, if pressed, they would claim it as a matter of faith to believe that God created the world and that Evolution is not creation, and that the Bible is the Word of God, every

* *Evolution and its Modern Critics.* By A. Morley Davies, D.Sc. (Murby & Co., 1937. 7/6.)

word being dictated by the Holy Spirit. It is difficult to find any common philosophical ground on which to argue with such prejudices. Probably the best policy is to teach the truth to those who are willing to learn, and to refuse to argue with those who think they know better. Such was the parabolic method of our Lord. Such, too, is the method which modern missionaries find best in dealing with non-Christian religions. Fundamentally it is the most Christian method, because it respects the right of the individual to form and hold his own opinion even if it is wrong. It would, however, be a mistake to suppose that the employment of any method will result in the speedy disappearance of Fundamentalism or anti-evolutionary propaganda. There is no promise of the extinction of error so long as the world lasts. Evolution is true, and on the whole its progress is upwards, but that does not imply (as the popular misconception has it) that in every place and in every way things inevitably tend to get better and better. The sides of the road of Evolution are strewn with failures — the remains of extinct saurians, Neanderthal men, and many others, which have not taken the upward path. Tares will remain amongst the wheat till the final harvest.

L. E. Browne.

THE KINGDOMS OF THE SPIRIT*

This is an interesting and valuable little book containing a highly personal philosophy of life based upon what the author holds to be those truths of religion which are common to all the great teachers of the world.

This book is especially interesting in that it is at one with another book recently reviewed in these columns but emanating from a very different quarter†, in the attention which it draws to the idea of *Karma*. It urges that the Buddhist doctrine of reincarnation which is held by such a large proportion of the human race cannot be valueless—its value for us westerners lying in the acceptance of moral responsibility which such a doctrine entails. The idea may be found in the Christian Gospel in such a phrase as 'as a man soweth so shall he reap,' but it is more implicit in the life and actions of Jesus than in his recorded utterances. It may well be that some such metaphysic from the East is required to supplement the eschatological teachings of the Gospel, which in their crudity are often repellent to the modern mind.

There are, says Mr. Houghton, many and diverse spheres of activity rising from the purely sensual plane to the purely spiritual plane. We fall or progress from plane to plane as we live our lives, and our present state is the outcome of our past state (*cf.* an illuminating comment upon Nico-

* *The Kingdoms of the Spirit.* By Claude Houghton. (C. W. Daniel Co. New Edition. Pp. 155. 1938. 5/-.)

† *The Philosophy of Courage.* By Philip Leon—the Oxford Group way.

demus's failure to understand spiritual rebirth, p. 66, 'had Nicodemus known spiritual experience of an order adequate for the realisation that "it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body," he would have understood at least something of the Master's statement concerning second birth.')

Yet Mr. Houghton is no dreary determinist but rather a poet with deep sensitiveness and honesty, and with a sense of beauty which reveals itself as he leads us through the various Kingdoms of the Spirit, until we reach the Kingdom of Love, the last stage. A few quotations may help to illustrate the quality of this book.

> 'We rise from self to sainthood . . . through the discipline of Law we rise from the slavery of self to the freedom of Love and consequently we pass from illusion to illusion until we obtain a glimpse of the shadow of Truth itself.'
>
> 'It is just the affirmation that nothing is accidental that the greatest prophets call upon us to make and it is for this reason that we are prone to destroy them as men, and worship them as Gods. If we label them as Gods it is easier to refuse to do that which they demanded of us as men.' 'Many of the ritualistic repetitions of creeds continue to exist because the majority of men only dare love mankind in theory.' 'We are afraid that finding heaven may involve losing earth and consequently as we are loth to surrender the beauty of our dreams for ever, we regard Heaven as a place to which we may attain after death, and therefore entirely fail to understand that heaven is but a word employed to express a state of being and that we may enter heaven here on earth, if we but dare to accept what love reveals to us as a reality and not a dream.'

That this is a book in the Johannine and Platonic tradition will be evident from these few citations. Since this is the only tradition that appears to be able to supply answers to the questions raised by our new psychological knowledge, I venture to suggest that this is a book which might be of great value to the psycho-therapist who is not hostile to religion and is seeking for material with which to help to rebuild faith and hope, and to synthesise after the process of analysis has been completed. The intelligent Christian layman, too, may find here the foundations for a philosophy in accordance with, and in development out of, the best Christian traditions, set out in not too difficult language.

> 'It is better to go out into the wilderness and deny, than to pretend that some mummy in the museum of Custom is the representation of the ever-living God.'

Those who may be in such a wilderness may be helped by the honest expression of the thoughts of this pilgrim to find again the living waters of religious belief. It is an excellent and elevating book, and should find a wide public.

J. D. Pearce-Higgins.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

Sir, THE CHURCH AND THE WAR.

May I, as one who has been for many years a regular reader of the *Modern Churchman* and a member of the Union, say how sorry I am to see the line that the paper is taking on the Church's attitude to war. No one will envy the lot of those who have to write leading articles at this time, as they are the target for criticism from all sorts of unexpected places.

I hope very much that modern churchmen as a whole do not subscribe to the points of view expressed in your leading article of last month (November), which so emphatically described this war as a crusade. (At least it didn't speak of a 'holy' crusade, for which we must be thankful.) Such talk, many of us believe, will do incalculable harm to the Church, since it is bound to give the impression that the Church is deliberately calling her sons to perform with her blessing the diabolical acts which modern warfare must require.

The Church may rightly give her blessing to the *cause* for which we are fighting, in so far as it is to defeat Hitlerism. But how can she possibly give her blessing to the *method* used to promote that cause? The method of modern warfare with its scientific butchery, its callous indifference to the value of human personality, its definite reliance upon bomb, bayonet and torpedo, is such a complete denial and reversal of the central Christian doctrine of the Cross, *i.e.* of victory and resurrection through self-sacrifice and suffering, that it is absolutely incomprehensible how so many good and sincere Christians can say that it is the lesser of two evils.

The Christian Pacifist is not *mainly* concerned with the commandment 'thou shalt not kill,' as is so often supposed, but with the fact that, not only does modern warfare transgress all or most of the commandments (including especially the first), but that it is, in effect, the final denial of the doctrine of the Cross, of the Divine method of redemption through complete self-giving love, which still remains a stumbling block to some, and foolishness to others.

'A clear head, a strong grasp of Christian principles and a sensitive moral consciousness' are most certainly needed, as your leading article truly says, if the Christian Church is to take the right line in this time of crisis. But it does not seem very rational, on the one hand, to expect to defeat Hitlerism or any other 'ism' (which is a mental concept) by force of arms (which is a trial of strength), nor, on the other hand, to speak of this war as a crusade (which is something being done for God), unless you are prepared to pray for the means by which the crusade is to be fought. I presume that not one of our Union is really prepared to pray 'God bless our bombs, our torpedoes and our tanks' or 'God bless my bayonet, and grant that it may go well home in Thy service.'

But it is merely 'the squeamish idealism' that you denounce, to say that such a prayer is irreverent, while at the same time saying that it is right that our youth should be taught to do these things.

As I am not an interloper but a member of the Union of long standing, and deeply appreciate much that the *Modern Churchmen* has printed and

the stand it has taken against obscurantism, I believe that you will kindly insert this letter, on a point that is so vital to the welfare of he Church.

W. Mauleverer,
Vicar of St. Francis', Salisbury.

St. Francis' House, Stratford Road, Salisbury.

[We have commented on this letter in this issue of the Signs of the Times.—Ed., *M.C.*]

SPIRIT-BEARING.

Sir,

The study of 'pneumatophoros,' which the Bishop of Truro contributes as an appendix to your own very interesting article in the *Modern Churchman* for May, is a valuable addition. It seems to me to justify further supplement which is perhaps important.

The Bishop says: 'In the Greek texts the word may be read as pneumatophóros spirit-bearing, or pneumatóphoros spirit-borne'; and adds that the editors of the new Lexicon of Patristic Greek print the former with some exceptions. He then gives several examples. In all these, it seems to me, spirit-borne is the sense best suited to the context.

In one case the reference is to the prophet Ezekäel; can it be doubted that *Ezek.* xxxvii, 1 was in mind? In another case to 'Elias who was taken up,' surely a spirit-borne man. In all the other cases there is perhaps reminiscence of *II Pet.* i, 21: '[It must be said] that every prophecy of scripture did not come to pass of one's own impulse, for not by the will of a man was a prophecy ever brought, but borne on by holy inspiration men spake from God.' That is at all events an impressive expression of the customary view, shown in many passages, *e.g.* 'Wisdom entering into holy souls maketh them friends of God and prophets,' where wisdom is plainly an equivalent of spirit, and the holy soul is spirit-borne to prophesey.

Re-reading your own article (May) leads me to conclude that all the passages in the New Testament referred to are more naturally read with the conception spirit-borne rather than spirit-bearing in mind. Certainly the two senses are in no wise antagonistic; they must perpetually merge in real life. But the distinction is not unimportant. The Christian conception of Grace is closely allied, and being conceived primarily as a gift of God it is more consonant with spirit-borne than with spirit-bearing.

Dr. Hunkin adds later some words of the first importance: 'The interesting point to notice is that the word pneumatophoros seems never actually to be found as an epithet of the word Church. It is only applied to individuals. This fact is not without significance.' True enough, and it confirms the interpretation spirit-borne. The gift of the spirit is made to persons, not communities, as experience and psychology testify alike. When so made it carries these persons on to move or mould the community of which they are members. In that way, and in no other, the Church is spirit-borne. We need not revive the gibe against conciliar decisions that 'the vote of the odd man is the voice of the Holy Ghost,' but we do well to remember that decisions have been reached by 'Athanasius *contra mundum,*' i.e. when a man spirit-borne has been carried forward to a triumphant conviction against long odds, and has become an arbiter for the reluctant Church.

There lies our need, and our hope for to-day. Faith as a grain of mustard seed in a few holy souls—οἱ ἅγιοι, those consecrated—borne forward by a spirit of power not their own, may move not mountains but the masses, and so may regenerate and unite both the Church and the international community of Europe.

E. P. Boys Smith.

PROOFS OF A FUTURE LIFE.

SIR,

Mr. Grimes in his letter rightly says that academic arguments of a philosophical character are convincing only to the minority who properly understand them. This remark applies equally to 'proofs' of Immortality and to 'disproofs' of Materialism. It is true also that all such elaborate reasonings might be short-circuited by the positive results of Psychic Research. But, as he points out, Psychic Research is in bad odour with orthodox scientists and orthodox religionists alike, and this seems to puzzle him.

But there is no cause for surprise. The orthodoxy of science is upset by any facts which suggest that mind and consciousness are something other than 'epiphenomena.' Hence the hostility of scientists. On the other hand, the orthodoxy of official religion is equally upset if the results of Psychic Research indicate that the 'miraculous' phenomena recorded in the New Testament are not of that unique character which traditional theology requires them to be. If nothing happened during the period of the New Testament record, which does not, or might not, happen to-day, what becomes of that 'uniqueness' of those events, which is needed to prove the 'uniqueness' of the revelation and divine interposition which then took place?

The truth is that scientific orthodoxy and religious orthodoxy both alike rest upon an intellectual framework of an *a priori* character, manufactured to fit, not *all* the facts, but a convenient selection of them.

Partington Vicarage, Manchester. J. C. HARDWICK.

SIR,

I have read Mr. Grime's letter and thoroughly agree with it. May I supplement it as follows?

If there be no survival, if this life is the end for each of us, there is so much suffering and unkindness and injustice in the world that one cannot believe in a loving and just God; the power behind the universe must be amoral or only good in parts. But if this life is not the end, it is not unreasonable to suppose that, with all its evils, it may be educative for the future, and not incompatible with a loving God.

In ordinary experience all our mental characteristics, our hopes and fears, our intuitions, our highest thoughts, only occur in connection with our physical bodies, and to many minds it seems almost logically impossible that such phenomena can be evidence of their existence separated from physical bodies. I know some people think otherwise, but unless there is evidence which can satisfy everyone, independent of his particular mental make-up or religious views, it is hopeless to expect a general belief in survival, on which the future of religion depends.

As Mr. Grimes says, it was unusual occurrences which were the cause of a belief in survival, and such might provide evidence of it nowadays.

But it is commonplace knowledge that, apart from the inaccuracy and unreliability of records, many undoubted phenomena which had been known for ages had for ages been misinterpreted. I need only mention the fixed firmament with the sun and stars moving about *on* it.

It is therefore necessary to investigate these experiences, to see if they are really evidence of survival, and this is one of the tasks of the Society for Psychical Reesarch. May I therefore give such a rough outline, as is possible in a letter, of some things which I have gathered from reading their publications for over fifty years:

The conscious self of each one of us is only a part of his whole self; he has an active mental self of which he is ordinarily unconscious.

It is from this self (technically called the subliminal self or mind) that, *inter alia,* our sudden impulses and flashes of genius proceed, as well as our dreams. When a person sees an appearance or hears a voice it is something in his subliminal self which has temporarily emerged into his consciousness in some form or other—or perhaps more accurately that the scope of his conscious self has temporarily been enlarged.

A medium is one whose subliminal self displaces, for a time, the conscious self in the control of voice or pen.

What, then, are the contents of this subliminal self and whence do they come? Undoubtedly most come from memories of ordinary life and from its events, but I think I can truthfully say that there is abundant evidence that some of its contents have not come through ordinary channels. The getting of facts from another mind — telepathy — seems confirmed, and apparently the communication is from, or at any rate through, the subliminal mind of the other person, while the subliminal mind of the recipient often elaborates or dramatises them, just as in dreams some past event is dramatised and forms the basis of the dream. The communications of a medium, then, are usually of a mixed nature, some perhaps from the medium's own subliminal memories normally acquired, and some perhaps acquired from other minds, all being often more or less elaborated and often distorted.

When these communications profess to come, as they usually do, from departed persons, it is necessary to see if they could have come from living ones, or from the medium's own memories, for *'entia non sunt multplicanda praeter necessitatem.'*

Many facts are stated which the medium could not possibly know, but which were within the knowledge of the deceased and which are confirmed by a living person who knows them. Where the living person is the one who is sitting with the medium, obviously the facts might have come from his mind.

But occasionally such facts are stated unknown to the sitter but known to some other person, who confirms them. It then becomes a question whether there has been any connection between this person and the medium or sitter, any link which might have given access to his mind. In some cases the connection, if any, is of the very slightest. Of course, one must not ignore the possibility of coincidences, but if a reasonable number of such cases be established one will not be able to escape from the dilemma that either a medium can obtain access to the mind of anyone in the world, even one with whom there is no link (a hypothesis which almost amounts to supposing that our subliminal selves form a part of or are rooted, so to speak, in a universal mind), or that the facts have come from discarnate minds, as they profess to have come. And if proved in certain cases it probably occurs in many others.

No scientific body ever gives a corporate judgment on the investigations of its members. It ensures that they are carried out by persons of high character who are highly skilled in their work. It publishes their work, and leaves it to the judgment of the readers. The Society for Psychical Research acts in this manner, and I think that no one who has read their publications thoroughly can fail to be impressed by them. To me they seem to be of the greatest importance for the future of religion and for the whole world.

J. H. Hume-Rothery.

Mendip House, Headington Hill, Oxford.

SIR,

It seems to me that there are only two perfectly logical theories as to immortality: one is perfectly true and the other is perfectly false. He that will do the Will of God will eventually be led to the true doctrine. This teaches: (1) There is a good God directing the universe; (2) all human beings have eternal spirits and free wills.

The false doctrine is (1) There is no God. (2) Human beings begin at birth, end at death; and have no free wills, but are mere links in an endless chain of causes and effects. The Bible is not always strictly logical, but it teaches: (1) There is a good God directing the universe; (2) it compares God with 'air' or 'wind' (*ruach*), and it teaches that all human beings are 'breaths' of this air. This would logically suggest they resemble God in being immortal and having free will.

E. E. BRADFORD, D.D.

Nordelph Vicarage, Downham Market, Norfolk.

SIR,

I was greatly interested in a letter contained in your November issue on the subject of psychic research and its bearing on the hope of mankind for a future life.

Your correspondent in his plea for the study of psychic phenomena states with truth that 'these experiences are far more common than we suppose, but are shunned because they have been a fruitful ground for superstition and exploitation by vulgar charlatans.' This, of course, is common knowledge, but what is not so well realised by a good many of us is that in this study we have one of the most potent weapons for combating the appalling materialism of the present age. As your correspondent aptly remarks:

'The Clergy should lend a helping hand . . . for a return to a general belief in a future life would undoubtedly have an enormous effect on the morale of the world. What indeed,' he asks, 'would do more?'

I fully concur, and can supplement what he writes by informing anyone who is interested that they would probably be surprised if they knew of the progress that has been made by the cool, detached method of scientific scrutiny on these phenomena (I refer to both spontaneous as well as experimental extra-sensory perception). In this connection I would recommend Mr. G. N. M. Tyrrell's summary of the work to date entitled 'Science and Psychical Phenomena.' I can inform your correspondent, however, that though the Church as a whole still frowns on these enquiries, having not yet completely shed the 'fear complex' inherited from the bad old days of rampant superstition, witchcraft and unhealthy 'mumbo-jumbo' of every kind, yet I am sure that a growing percentage of the clergy are much more inclined to realise the tremendous potentialities of the work and give it their earnest attention.

For the Church as a whole to rush headlong into the matter would, in my humble opinion, be a mistake. The clergy have the well-being of their flocks to consider, and those of us who work on psychic research know that the subject is apt to attract a fringe of unstable and weak-minded folk for whom it is most unsuitable.

V. M. AUSTIN (MRS.).

Member of the Council, International Institute for Psychic Investigation, Walton House, Walton Street, London, S.W.3.

MARVELS: MIRACULOUS OR NON-MIRACULOUS?

SIR,

The Modernist, in discussing miracles, separates *Fact* and *Interpretation*. Some of the alleged miracles are not facts and some of the alleged facts are not miracles. The Modernist rightly states that every discussion about miracle ought rightly to begin with settling the question of fact.

May I give you the following indisputable fact?

Three years ago near Secunderabad in Southern India, I saw a Hindu priest walk slowly barefoot over red-hot coals over sixty feet in length. Expert examination preceded and followed this. There was no treatment of the feet beforehand and no sign of burning after the walk. This has since been done under expert and sceptical supervision.

Of it, in a leading article, the *Observer* said: 'This is a genuine "miracle" in the original sense of something to be wondered at from the standpoint of ordinary experience and reasoning. But the modern mind will regard it not as an interruption of the Laws of Nature, but as revealing a hint of her unprobed inwardness.'

The Hindu priest whom I saw was a friend of mine. He was a man of great faith who spent much of his life in prayer.

Knowing this man, it is not difficult to believe in the miracles ascribed to Our Lord, who was in constant communion with God.

In the dictionary the definition of a miracle is 'anything wonderful.' The truth is that 'miracles' happen only to people possessed of the capacity to wonder.

It is a mark of greatness—and true greatness is always inseparable from humility—to retain this power of appreciation.

Some day we may be able to understand the relationship between physical and mental forces. When we do, it need not strip it of its marvel. To have minds capable of understanding this relationship would simply double the marvel.

E. J. STROVER.

THE SPIRIT OF THE CZECHS.

SIR,

The Czech authorities in England, who under Dr. Benesh are working for the liberation of the Czech nation from Nazi tyranny, have appointed me as one of their representatives. One of my duties is to address English audiences on the history, aspirations and present condition of the Czech nation. I shall be glad to address congregations about Czech religious and cultural ideals. I shall certainly highly appreciate every opportunity to serve in this way in order to deepen the friendship between Christians in the United Kingdom and the country of John Hus.

FRANK M. HNIK.

26 Annesley Road, Rose Hill, Oxford.

[The Rev. Dr. Hnik is well known to the Modern Churchmen's Union, particularly to those who attended our last Cambridge Conference. He is a distinguished teacher in the John Hus Faculty of Theology at Prague and has written in English a remarkable book on the social ideals and activities of the Christian Church.

There must be many English Church-people who would be glad to listen to Dr. Hnik. He charges no fee, but we are sure that those who invite him would gladly be responsible for hospitality and travelling expenses.—ED., *M.C.*]